

### REMARKS

Claims 6-10 are currently pending and stand rejected.

Claim 6 is canceled herein without prejudice.

Claim 11 is newly presented herein. The Applicant informs the undersigned that no new matter is presented as a result of new Claim 11, and further informs the undersigned that:

- 1) support for the feature "a hydrophilic resin coating layer is provided on the side of the absorbent of the water vapor permeable waterproof sheet" may be found at least at page 15, lines 12-14, and in Figures 4 and 8, of the pending application;
- 2) support for the feature "information mark layer is provided on the side of the absorbent of the hydrophilic resin coating layer" may be found at least at page 15, lines 10-11, and in Figures 4 and 8, of the pending application; and
- 3) support for the feature "a hydrophilic resin coating layer is provided on the side of the absorbent of the water vapor permeable waterproof sheet, and information mark layer is provided on the side of the absorbent of the

hydrophilic resin coating layer" may be found at least at page 6, lines 8-12, and in Figures 1-8, of the pending application.

The Description section of the pending application (*see id.*, pages 1-17) is replaced herein with the appended replacement Description. Additionally, replacement sheets for Figures 1-4 and 6-8 are presented with the instant response. The Applicant informs the undersigned that no new matter is presented as a result of these amendments.

#### DRAWINGS

The Office Action objects to the drawings of the pending application, and does not approve the replacement drawings submitted in the response filed on July 10, 2009, "because cross-sections should be denoted by Roman or Arabic numerals, not letters." See page 2, section 2, of the Office Action.

The Applicant respectfully points out that replacement sheets for Figures 1-4 and 6-8 of the pending application are presented with the instant response. In view of these replacement sheets, the Applicant finds the instant objection to the drawings to be moot at least because cross-sections are denoted by Roman or Arabic numerals rather than letters.

For at least the foregoing rationale, the Applicant respectfully submits that the figures of the pending Application overcome the objection to the drawings as set forth in the Office Action. As such, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

#### DESCRIPTION

The Office Action objects to the Description of the pending application, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as being "replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact." See page 3, section 5, of the Office Action. The Office Action also objects to the disclosure "because of [various] informalities." See page 4, section 6, of the Office Action.

The Applicant respectfully points out that the Description is replaced herein. See pages 1-22 of the appended replacement Description. Additionally, the Applicant respectfully submits that the appended replacement Description is sufficiently clear, concise and exact, within the purview of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. As such, the Applicant finds the instant objection to the Specification to be moot.

For at least the foregoing rationale, the Applicant respectfully submits that the disclosure section of the pending application, as amended herein, overcomes the objection to the Specification as set forth in the Office Action. As such, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

### CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 6-10 are objected to because of a number of informalities that the Examiner associates with Claim 6. The Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 6 is canceled herein, and that Claims 7-10 are amended to depend from new Claim 11. Additionally, the Applicant respectfully submits that the subject informalities are not associated with or pertinent to new Claim 11.

For at least the foregoing rationale, the Applicant finds the instant objections to Claims 6-10 to be moot. As such, withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejects Claims 6-10 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter not sufficiently described in the specification.

With respect to Claim 6, the Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 6 is canceled herein. As such, the Applicant finds the instant rejection of Claim 6 to be moot.

With respect to Claim 7, the Applicant informs the undersigned that support for Claim 7 may be found at least at page 12, lines 18-21, of the pending application.

With respect to Claim 8, the Applicant informs the undersigned that support for the feature “a length and width of the hydrophilic resin coating layer is greater than a length and width of the information mark layer” may be found at least in Figures 4 and 8 of the pending application, and that support for the feature “the information mark layer and the hydrophilic resin coating layer have a thickness of 1 $\mu$ m to 20 $\mu$ m” may be found at least at page 13, lines 16-18, and at page 15, lines 11-13, of the pending application.

With respect to Claim 9, the Applicant informs the undersigned that support for Claim 9 may be found at least at page 21, lines 4-6 and 11-14, and in Figures 7 and 8, of the pending application.

With respect to Claim 10, the Applicant informs the undersigned that support for Claim 10 may be found at least at page 13, lines 19-22, of the pending application.

For at least the foregoing rationale, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 7-10 are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. As such, withdrawal of the instant rejections of Claims 7-10, as well as allowance of these claims, is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a)

The Office Action states that Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Cammarota et al. (US 6,307,119; hereinafter “Cammarota”), and in

further view of Timmons (US 4,022,211). The Office Action also states that Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Cammarota, and in further view of Timmons. The Office Action further states that Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Cammarota, and in further view of Timmons, and in further view of Ikeda et al. (US 2003/0148091; hereinafter "Ikeda"). Moreover, the Office Action states that Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Cammarota, and in further view of Timmons, and in further view of Yabuki et al. (US 2002/0061595; hereinafter "Yabuki").

With respect to Claim 6, the Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 6 is canceled herein. As such, the Applicant finds the instant rejection of Claim 6 to be moot.

With respect to Claims 7-10, the Applicant has reviewed the cited art and respectfully submits that Claims 7-10 are patentable over this art for at least the following rationale.

Claims 7-10 are dependent on new Claim 11, and include the features of Claim 11. Hence, by demonstrating that Cammarota, alone or in combination with Timmons, Ikeda and/or Yabuki, does not teach or suggest the embodiment of Claim 11, it is also demonstrated that Cammarota, alone or in combination with Timmons, Ikeda and/or Yabuki, does not teach or suggest the embodiments of Claims 7-10.

Independent Claim 11 recites (emphasis added):

An absorbent article comprising, in integral formation, at least a liquid permeable top sheet, an absorbent, a water vapor permeable waterproof sheet, and a liquid impermeable back sheet in this order, the absorbent article further comprising:

a hydrophilic resin coating layer is provided on the side of the absorbent of the water vapor permeable waterproof sheet, and information mark layer is provided on the side of the absorbent of the hydrophilic resin coating layer; and

a permeability of the water vapor permeable waterproof sheet of a portion, which the hydrophilic resin coating layer is provided on the water vapor permeable waterproof sheet, is lower than a permeability of the water vapor permeable waterproof sheet of a portion, which the hydrophilic resin coating layer is not provided on the water vapor permeable waterproof sheet.

The Applicant has reviewed the cited art, and does not find Cammarota, alone or in combination with Timmons, Ikeda and/or Yabuki, to teach or suggest the embodiment of Claim 11.

In particular, the Applicant finds Cammarota to disclose "[a]bsorbent articles having wetness indicating graphics incorporating a training zone". See title of Cammarota. However, the Applicant does not find these "[a]bsorbent articles having wetness indicating graphics incorporating a training zone" to teach, or even suggest:

a hydrophilic resin coating layer is provided on the side of the absorbent of the water vapor permeable waterproof sheet, and information mark layer is provided on the side of the absorbent of the hydrophilic resin coating layer; as claimed.

Moreover, the Applicant does not find Timmons, Ikeda or Yabuki to overcome the aforementioned shortcoming of Cammarota. Indeed, the Applicant respectfully submits

that the embodiment at issue would not be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art even if the cited art of record were to be combined.

For at least the foregoing rationale, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 11 is patentable over Cammarota, alone or in combination with Timmons, Ikeda and/or Yabuki, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a). As such, allowance of Claim 11 is respectfully requested.

With respect to Claims 7-10, the Applicant respectfully points out that Claims 7-10 depend from independent Claim 11, and recite further features. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 7-10 overcome the instant rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a), and that Claims 7-10 are each in a condition for allowance as being dependent on a distinguishable base claim. As such, withdrawal of the instant rejections of Claims 7-10, as well as allowance of Claims 7-10, is respectfully requested.



### CONCLUSION

In light of the above-listed remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending Application overcomes the objections and rejections of record. Moreover, based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 7-11 are currently in a condition for allowance. Therefore, allowance of Claims 7-11 is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below-listed telephone number.

The foregoing notwithstanding, kindly note that the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is hereby authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period for response, pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a), said petition requesting an extension of time of the number of months available to allow this response to be timely filed, and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to Deposit Account No. 12-0415.

Respectfully submitted,

LADAS & PARRY LLP

Date: December 10, 2009

By: /Jerry A. Crandall/

Jerry A. Crandall  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 56,765

5670 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD,  
SUITE 2100  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90036  
(323) 934-2300

I hereby certify that this document is being transmitted to  
the United States Patent and Trademark Office via  
electronic filing.

December 10, 2009

(Date of Transmission)

Lonnie Louie

(Name of Person Transmitting)

/Lonnie Louie/

(Signature)